

### Remarks

The substitute drawing should be accepted and is submitted in replacement of the drawing presently on file. The margins have been corrected.

Claims 5 and 6 were objected to by the Examiner because of asserted informalities.

These claims have been amended with many of the Examiner's suggestions incorporated into these claims. To the extent any objections remain, they are respectfully traversed.

Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, as being indefinite on a variety of grounds. The claims have been amended and these rejections should be withdrawn. To the extent any such rejections remain, they are respectfully traversed.

In particular, the word "combines" is proper given the rephrasing of terminology in the claims to set forth active steps (e.g., providing; printing).

The phrase "is made which has the qualities described in" has been deleted from claim 5. In addition, the phrase "has the qualities described in claim 4 and" has been deleted from claim 6. Qualities are recited in each of these claims. These general statements are unnecessary.

The term "highly" has been deleted from claims 5 and 6. This relative term is unnecessary to the claims.

Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to delete the phrase "other types of damage" as being unnecessary to the patentability of these claims.

Claim 6 has been amended to delete the phrase "has the properties described in this claim," and to identify a list of qualities.

In view of these changes, the 35 USC § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, rejection of claims 4-6 should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) on the basis of U.S. Patent No. 6,030,002 to Charley et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,672,413 to Taylor et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Charley et al is presently understood as set forth below.

Claim 4 requires the act of "printing a colored image on the film which is translucent".

Charley et al. teaches away from this process.

Charley et al. recites: "Another object and advantage of the invention is that mirror-image printing is used. As such, the border design is created by printing on only one side of the film yet the border design gives the impression that has been printed on both sides of the film." (Col. 1, lines 52-56 of Charley et al.). Mirror image printing is explained in Charley et al. at Col.

2, lines 63-66, wherein Charley et al. recites: "...the preferred method involves mirror-image printing wherein the translucent film 16 is printed with a sequence of colors which are then topped with an opaque white 34, the opaque white 34 then topped with the identical sequence of colors."

As a result of the opaque white, the Charley et al. image is not translucent and thus the claimed requirement that "the resultant window covering has a translucent colored image" is not produced by the Charley et al. process.

At Col. 3, lines 8-12, Charley et al. explains that: "The result of the mirror-image printing is that the border design 20 appears as though it has been printed on both sides of the translucent film 16 when in fact the printing has occurred on only one side."

Col. 2, lines 66 through Col. 3, line 8, explains that the opaque white layer is an intermediate layer during printing in Charley et al. and thus the colored printed image would not be translucent.

Charley et al. is similar to the prior art process described in the next to last paragraph on page 6 of Applicant's specification wherein it is recited: "One means of achieving an image which can be viewed from both sides would be to print the image on a transparent sheet, cover the image with opaque white, then reprint the image again. Thus, the image could be seen from either side of the sheet, but it would not achieve the desired translucency, instead being entirely opaque."

Taylor et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Charley et al.

Therefore, claim 4 should be in condition for allowance.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) on the basis of Charley et al. in view of Taylor et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,054,208 to Riga et al. and Great Britain reference GB 2,324,381, and further in view of the advertisement for Solar Stat.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4 and should be allowable for the reasons given above in support of its parent claim 4. In addition, claim 5 is independently patentable. For example, claim 5 requires the act of applying a varnish comprising UV absorber and hardening agent with the resultant window covering having a translucent printed color image.

In Charley et al., as pointed out at Col. 3, line 7, the final station involves the application of a varnish (which is after the opaque layer has been applied). Thus, the varnished image in Charley et al. would not be translucent.

The other references applied by the Examiner in rejecting claim 5 do not cure the deficiencies of Charley et al. Therefore, claim 5 should be in condition for allowance.

Claim 6 requires the act of printing a colored image which is translucent and also the act of applying ultra-violet light absorbing varnishes and hardening agents to the colored image in such a manner that the resultant window covering has a translucent printed colored image thereon.

As pointed out above in connection with claim 5, Charley et al. involves applying a varnish to an image which is opaque.

The other references applied by the Examiner in rejecting claim 6 do not cure the deficiencies of Charley et al. Therefore, claim 6 should be in condition for allowance.

Given the fact that it is an "object and advantage of the invention" in Charley et al. to provide the mirror-image printing by printing on only one side of the film, (Col. 1, lines 52-55), one would not modify Charley et al. to eliminate the opaque layer as it is submitted this would be contrary to the teachings of Charley et al.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, the application should be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Should the application not be in condition for allowance, an interview is hereby requested.

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 226-7391  
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By

  
David P. Petersen

Registration No. 28,106